

REMARKS

In the Official Office Action of April 19, 2007, the Examiner has noted that claims 6 through 9 have been withdrawn from further consideration since they relate to a non-elected invention and thus can serve as the basis for a later filed divisional application.

Claim 11 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite because it was not clear if the biopolymer is a combination of all the recited polymers. Accordingly, claim 10 has been amended by inserting the word "or" between the different types of biopolymers and hence it is deemed that the rejection has been rendered moot.

Claims 1 and 10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Claeys, US Patent 5,882,787. However, the Patent Office has stated that claims 2 through 5 are only objected to and would be allowable if written in independent form including the limitations of claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 10 by incorporating the subject matter of claim 2 and claims 11, respectively, therein. Hence it is deemed that claims 1, 3-5 and 10 are allowable.


Applicants have added new claims 12-19 to further define the invention. Generally, the added claims relate to specific types of biopolymers as well as to specific types of inert particle fillers.

Accordingly, it is deemed that claims 1, 3-5, 10, and 12-19 are in condition for allowance.

Should there be any objections as to the allowance of the claims, a telephone call to the undersigned is solicited so that such objections can be discussed.

Respectfully submitted,

HUDAK, SHUNK & FARINE CO. LPA



By: Daniel J. Hudak
Registration No. 25,879

2020 Front Street, Suite 307
Cuyahoga Falls, OH 44221-3257
(330) 535-2220
Attorney Docket No. NTIC-H-CIP (NTICPO115A)